UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/814,931 | 03/30/2004 | Peter E. Hart | 20412-08340 | 7925 |

76137 7590 03/26/2008

RICOH/FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| THOMPSON, JAMES A | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2625 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 03/26/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/814,931 | HART ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | JAMES A. THOMPSON | 2625 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 Oct 2007, 28 Dec 2007, 23 Jan 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-71* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 March 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/26/07,1/23/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments, see "Response to Rejection under 35 USC 112", filed 28 December 2007, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph have been withdrawn.

2. Applicant's arguments filed 28 December 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

*Applicant argues* that Marggraff (USPN 6,750,978) does not teach printing a plurality of machine-readable codes that associate time locations within the electronic representation of music, and that Marggraff teaches away from printing multiple bar codes on a print medium.

*Examiner replies* that Marggraff teaches printing a plurality of machine-readable codes that link (associate) time locations within the electronic representation of music (column 6, line 63 to column 7, line 3; and column 7, lines 42-65 of Marggraff), as set forth in the previous office action mailed 28 September 2007. Column 6, line 63 to column 7, line 3 of Marggraff discusses the different types of media that may be used with the invention disclosed in Marggraff. One of these types of media includes music sheets (column 7, line 3 of Marggraff). Column 7, lines 42-65 of Marggraff discusses how a plurality of different selectable regions of print medium can be selected to provide different responses, such as playing music. Different regions of sheet music would naturally provide an association with different time locations. If there are a plurality of selectable regions in the print medium, the print medium corresponding to sheet music, then the printed machine-readable codes which produce the associated audio music associate time locations within the electronic representation of the music.

Marggraff does not teach away from Applicant's claims. Column 2, lines 4-9 of Marggraff refer to the problems of the prior art systems, which Marggraff addresses and solves (column 2, lines 20-21 of Marggraff). Column 6, lines 59-62 of Marggraff simply teaches that *special* printing processes are not needed to print the plurality of bar codes. So, Marggraff solves the problems of greater difficulty and greater expense associated with printing a plurality of bar codes, and does not require special printing processes to print the plurality of bar codes. Thus, Applicant's analysis of Marggraff is erroneous since Marggraff teaches a simpler solution to printing multiple bar codes on a print medium.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**4. Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 19, 20, 22, 26-31, 35-37, 48, 49, 51, 52, 56-58 and 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima (USPN 6,774,951) in view of Kubota (US Pat. Appl. Pub. 2003/0084462) and Marggraff (USPN 6,750,978).**

**Regarding claims 1, 30 and 51:** Narushima discloses a printer (column 24, lines 55-62 of Narushima – *the unitary printing apparatus*) for printing time-based media (column 4, lines 35-52 of Narushima – e.g., *broadcast picture/video*), the printer comprising: an interface for receiving time-based media from an external source (column 8, lines 4-15 of Narushima - *receiver*); a media processing system (the system of figure 8 of Narushima) coupled to the interface to receive the time-based media, the media processing system creating a printed representation of the time-based media (figure 22(S59) of Narushima) and determining an electronic representation of the time-based media (figure 21(S34) of Narushima); a printed output system (printer 32, column 24, lines 55-62 of Narushima) in communication with the media processing system to receive the printed representation, the printed output system producing a corresponding printed output from the printed representation of the time-based media (figure 22(S62-S65) of Narushima); and a electronic output system (e.g., display 31, column 24, lines 55-62 of Narushima) in communication with the media processing system to receive the electronic representation, the electronic output system producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media (figure 21 of Narushima).

Narushima further teaches that the time-based media that is received and printed are music (column 2, lines 60-67 of Narushima).

Narushima does not disclose expressly that the printed representation includes a representation of the time-based media at a plurality of times thereof and a plurality of machine-readable codes that associate time locations within the electronic representation with the plurality of times represented in the printed representation.

Kubota discloses that the printed representation (music) includes a representation of the time-based media at a plurality of times (*lyrics of the music*) thereof (figure 16 of Kubota – *portions of lyrics shown along with music, and thus at a plurality of times with the music*).

Narushima and Kubota are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor, namely the printing and processing of time-based media data, particularly music. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a representation of the lyrics, along with the music, as taught by Kubota. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a user would often wish to know how to remember the music and sing along with the music, which would require that lyrics be processed along with the music itself. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kubota with Narushima.

Narushima in view of Kubota does not disclose expressly a plurality of machine-readable codes that associate time locations within the electronic representation with the plurality of times represented in the printed representation.

Marggraff teaches printing a plurality of machine-readable codes that associate time locations within the electronic representation of music (column 6, line 63 to column 7, line 3; and column 7, lines 42-65 of Marggraff), and thus the plurality of times represented in the printed representation taught by Narushima.

Narushima in view of Kubota is analogous art with respect to Marggraff since they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the printing and processing of time-based media data, particularly music. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to also print the machine readable codes, as taught by Marggraff. The suggestions for doing so would have been (1) figure 16 of Kubota demonstrates that a user would link the music to the time location of the printed lyric, (2) Narushima teaches using machine-readable codes that link to the electronic representation of printed media (column 20, lines 20-35 of Narushima), (3) traditional print media are typically easier to use (column 1, lines 40-45 of Marggraff), and (4) printing machine readable codes would have allowed users easily accessing additional information about a particular subject being read by the user (column 1, lines 45-60 of Marggraff). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Marggraff with Narushima in view of Kubota to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 51.

Further regarding claim 30: The printer of claim 30 is embodied within the printer of claim 1.

Further regarding claim 51: The method of claim 51 is performed by the printer of claim 1.

**Regarding claims 2, 31 and 52:** Narushima teaches wherein the interface comprises a single communication interface allowing the printer to be communicatively coupled to an electronic device, the electronic device providing the time-based media to the printer (receiver, column 8, lines 4-8 of Narushima).

**Regarding claims 6, 35 and 56:** Narushima teaches wherein the external source is a media broadcaster, and wherein the interface comprises a media broadcast receiver that can be tuned to a media broadcast (column 9, lines 15-20 of Narushima).

**Regarding claims 7, 36 and 57:** Narushima teaches wherein the interface comprises an embedded receiver selected from a group consisting of: an embedded TV receiver (column 7, lines 43-50 of Narushima), an embedded radio receiver, an embedded short-wave radio receiver, an embedded satellite radio receiver, an embedded two-way radio, and an embedded cellular phone.

**Regarding claims 8, 37 and 58:** Narushima teaches, wherein the interface comprises an embedded device selected from a group consisting of: an embedded heat sensor, an embedded humidity sensor, an embedded National Weather Service radio alert receiver, and an embedded TV Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) alert monitor (since Narushima teaches receiving TV Broadcast, column 3, lines 40-45 of Narushima; the system inherently receives/monitor TV Emergency Broadcast).

**Regarding claims 19 and 48:** Narushima teaches wherein the electronic output system is coupled to a speaker system and sends an audio signal to the speaker system (column 13, lines 30-36 of Narushima).

**Regarding claims 20, 49 and 67:** Narushima teaches wherein the electronic output system comprises an embedded sound player for generating the audio signal (column 13, lines 30-36 of Narushima).

**Regarding claim 22:** Narushima teaches wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded multimedia server (figure 10(S3) of Narushima).

**Regarding claim 26:** Narushima teaches wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded video motion detection module (the logic that detects, decode video motion signal of S60, S58 to form video images/frame, S59 – figure 22 of Narushima).

**Regarding claim 27:** Narushima teaches a user interface (display, figure 10 of Narushima) coupled to the media processing system, the user interface providing information to a user about at least one of the printed representation and the electronic representation of the time-based media, the user interface further accepting input from a user to cause the media processing system to modify at least one

of the printed representation and the electronic representation of the time-based media (figure 10; column 12, lines 29-35; and column 14, lines 29-45 of Narushima).

**Regarding claim 28:** Narushima teaches wherein the user interface communicates with a user through a computer system (column 11, lines 50-67 of Narushima, communication network such as Internet is a computer system, or the server, column 14, lines 10-15 of Narushima) coupled to the printer.

**Regarding claim 29:** Narushima teaches wherein the media processing system determines at least one of the printed representation and the electronic representation with assistance from an external computing device (e.g., server, column 14, lines 10-15 of Narushima).

**Regarding claim 68:** Narushima teaches wherein producing the electronic output comprises generating a video signal for playback by a display system (figure 21(S33,S36) of Narushima).

**Regarding claims 69-71:** Marggraff teaches wherein the machine-readable codes comprise bar codes (column 1, lines 63-67 of Narushima).

**5. Claims 3, 4, 11, 32, 33, 40, 53, 54 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff as applied to claims 1, 30 and 51 above, and further in view of Takahashi (USPN 6,674,538).**

**Regarding claims 3, 4, 11, 32, 33, 40, 53, 54 and 61:** Narushima teaches his invention is related/used to print video images from all sources that would supply video images (column 1, lines 22-44 of Narushima).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not teach wherein the interface comprises a removable media storage reader or wherein the interface comprises a video input device selected from a group consisting of: a DVD reader, a video cassette tape reader, and a flash card reader.

Takahashi teaches that video images, supplied to a printer to be printed, come from a video cassette tape reader reading a video tape (figure 1(41) and column 4, lines 35-50 of Takahashi).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff is analogous art with respect to Takahashi since they are in the same field of endeavor, namely printing time-based (video) multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Narushima to include: wherein the interface comprises a removable media storage reader or wherein the interface is a video cassette tape reader. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to have modified Narushima by the teaching of Takahashi because: (a) it would have provide more usable functions to the system of Narushima; and (b) printing video picture from a video tape reader is well-known in the art and widely used by different users; therefore, the

modification of Narushima would attract more users/buyers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Takahashi with Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3, 4, 11, 32, 33, 40, 53, 54 and 61.

**6. Claims 5, 12, 34, 41, 55 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff as applied to claims 1, 30 and 51 above, and further in view of Assis (USPN 5,661,783).**

**Regarding claims 5, 12, 34, 41, 55 and 62:** Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not teach wherein the interface comprises an embedded audio recorder, and wherein the external source of media is a series of sounds that are converted into an electrical format by the embedded audio recorder and then provided to the media processing system.

Assis teaches that it is well known in the art for a printer (figure 1(14) of Assis) to print a series of sounds that are converted into an electrical format by the audio recorder (column 4, line 50 of Assis) and then provided to the printer (column 4, lines 45-51 of Assis).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff is analogous art with respect to Assis because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely printing and processing digital image data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Narushima to include: wherein the interface comprises an embedded audio recorder, and wherein the external source of media is a series of sounds that are converted into an electrical format by the embedded audio recorder and then provided to the media processing system. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to have modified Narushima by the teaching of Assis because: (a) it would have provide more usable functions to the system of Narushima; and (b) printing audio from a recorder is well-known in the art and widely used by different users; therefore, the modification of Narushima would attract more users/buyers. Note: It is well known in the art that the phone recorder using audio cassette tape. Using audio cassette tape in the system of Narushima and Assis would have been obvious because (a) it would have provided the system of Narushima with unlimited memory by replacing a fully loaded tape with a new one; and (b) it would have allowed the user to carry easily transportable removable tape instead of the heavy system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Assis with Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5, 12, 34, 41, 55 and 62.

**7. Claims 9, 38 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff as applied to claims 1, 30 and 51 and further in view of Conway (USPN 5,444,476).**

**Regarding claims 9, 38 and 59:** Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not teach wherein the interface comprises a embedded screen capture hardware.

Conway teaches that it is well known in the art to provide a screen capture hardware for generating video images (column 2, lines 5-15 of Conway).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff is analogous art with respect to Conway since they are in the same field of endeavor, namely providing users with video images. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Narushima to include: wherein the interface comprises a embedded screen capture hardware. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Narushima by the teaching of Conway because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data; and (b) using a well known method of obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Conway with Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9, 38 and 59.

**8. Claims 10, 39 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff as applied to claims 1, 30 and 51 and further in view of Hon (USPN 4,907,973).**

**Regarding claims 10, 39 and 60:** Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not teach wherein the interface comprises an ultrasonic pen capture device.

Hon teaches it is well known in the art to provide a ultrasonic pen capture device for generating the video image frames to be view on a computer (figure 9 of Hon).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff is analogous art with respect to Hon because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely providing users with video images. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Narushima to include: wherein the interface comprises ultrasonic pen capture device. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Narushima by the teaching of Hon because: (a) it would have given user more options of how to obtain the video data;

and (b) using a well known method of storing and obtaining video is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method of storing and obtaining video that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hon with Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10, 39 and 60.

**9. Claims 13, 14, 42, 43 and 63-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff as applied to claims 1, 30 and 51 above, and further in view of Reed (USPN 6,665,092).**

**Regarding claims 13, 14, 42, 43, 63, 64, 65 and 66:** Narushima teaches to store the electronic representation (column 12, line 65 to column 13, line 10 of Narushima).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not teach wherein the electronic output system is configured to write the electronic representation to a removable media storage device such as a computer disk and a computer-readable medium.

Reed teaches storing the electronic representation to a removable media storage device such as a computer disk and a computer-readable medium (column 4, lines 34-45; and column 8, lines 52-60 of Reed).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff is analogous art with respect to Reed because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storing and processing images in a printer. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Narushima to include: wherein the electronic output system is configured to write the electronic representation to a removable media storage device such as a computer disk and a computer-readable medium. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Narushima by the teaching of Reed because: (a) it would have provided the system of Narushima with unlimited memory by replacing a fully loaded memory with a new one; and (b) it would have allowed the user to carry easily transportable removable memory instead of the heavy system. Note: A removable storage medium, inherently is disposable and self-destructing over time (normal wear and tear). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reed with Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13, 14, 42, 43, 63, 64, 65 and 66.

**10. Claims 15, 16, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff and in further view of Reed (USPN 6,665,092) and Fujita (USPN 5,903,538).**

**Regarding claims 15, 16, 44 and 45:** Narushima as modified by Reed teaches storing the video to a removable medium, see discussion of claims 13, 14, 42 and 43.

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not teach output system comprises a handling mechanism to accommodate a plurality of removable storage device, and wherein the handling mechanism is a tray.

Fujita teaches it is well known in the art to store video images in a removable storing medium (column 1, lines 25-45) at a handling mechanism. The handling mechanism accommodates a plurality of removable storage device, and wherein the handling mechanism is a tray (fig. 6).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff is analogous art with respect to Fujita because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storing and processing video images. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include: a handling mechanism to accommodate a plurality of removable storage device, and wherein the handling mechanism is a tray. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Narushima by the teaching of Fujita because it would have made the management and operation of high volume data possible as taught by Fujita at column 1, lines 20-25. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Fujita with Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to obtain the invention as specified in claims 15, 16, 44 and 45.

**11. Claims 17, 18, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff as applied to claims 1 and 30 above and further in view of Howald (USPN 6,153,667).**

**Regarding claims 17, 18, 46 and 47:** Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not teach wherein the electronic output system comprises a disposable media writer/self-destructing media writer.

Howald teaches it is well known in the art to print with a media writer wherein the media writer is a disposable media writer and self-destructing media writer (column 4, lines 60-67 of Howald).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff is analogous art with respect to Howald because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data processing and printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified

Narushima to include: wherein the electronic output system comprises a disposable media writer/self-destructing media writer. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was make to have modified Narushima by the teaching of Hon because: (a) using a well known method printing is an advantage because it would provide user with a reliable method printing that others have invested lots of money and time to improve and research on the well known method. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Howald with Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to obtain the invention as specified in claims 17, 18, 46 and 47.

**12. Claims 21 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff as applied to claims 1 and 30 above and further in view of well-known prior art.**

**Regarding claims 21 and 50:** Narushima teaches information displayed is obtained on Internet (column 14, lines 15-25, column 11, lines 50-55).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not teaches the electronic output system comprises an embedded web page display.

**Official Notice is taken** that it is well known in the art that computing devices on Internet comprises an embedded web page display. Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to include: an embedded web page display such that the Narushima invention can fully utilized Internet technology.

**13. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Perkins (USPN 6,106,457).**

**Regarding claims 23 and 24:** Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded audio encryption module and embedded video encryption module.

Perkins teaches media processing system comprises an embedded audio encryption module and embedded video encryption module (column 34, lines 45-52 and lines 62-65 of Perkins).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff is analogous art with respect to Perkins because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely using computing devices to transmit and receive audio and video signals. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to have modified Narushima to include: wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded audio encryption module and embedded video encryption module. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Narushima by the teaching of Perkins because it is well known in the art that encrypted data is not easily to be stolen or misused by unauthorized users. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Perkins with Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to obtain the invention as specified in claims 23 and 24.

**14. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Markow (USPN 6,175,489).**

**Regarding claim 25:** Narushima teaches using speaker (column 13, lines 30-36) for reproducing the audio signals received from the Broadcast.

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff does not wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded audio sound localization module.

Markow teaches an embedded audio sound localization module (column 3, lines 19-27 of Markow – *the computer software that generates signals to the speaker to create audio sound localization*).

Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff is analogous art with respect to Markow because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the use of audio devices to transmit audio data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Narushima to include: wherein the media processing system comprises an embedded audio sound localization module. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Narushima by the teaching of Markow because it would create more pleasure listening environment for users. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Markow with Narushima in view of Kubota and Marggraff to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

***Conclusion***

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES A. THOMPSON whose telephone number is (571)272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Edward L. Coles/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/J. A. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

18 March 2008